

CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: December 9, 2003

Location: Anasazi Heritage Center

Time: 9:00 – 3:30

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Bob Clayton	Chris Majors	Liz Tozer	Bud Poe
Chuck McAfee	Mark Varien	Kelly Wilson	Bill Lipe

Bureau of Land Management Attendees:

LouAnn Jacobson	Victoria Atkins	Susan Thomas
Steve Kandell	Laura Kochanski	

Jones & Stokes Attendees:

Jennifer Zakrowski

Public Attendees:

Chris Nickel, Hovenweep National Monument; Gloria McMahon, Sun Canyon Ranch; John Nolan, former business owner; Lynn Udick, adjacent land owner; Tim Hovezak, citizen; Leslie Sesler, archaeologist/citizen; Gala Pock, adjacent private landowner; Ruth Lambert, San Juan Mountains Association; Amber Clark, San Juan Citizen's Alliance; Nate Thompson, Cortez Journal; and Pati Temple, adjacent land owner.

Agenda

9:00am - 9:10am	Greetings and Introductions
9:10am - 9:20am	Approval of Minutes from the November 14th Meeting
9:20am - 9:30am	Planning Update
9:30am - 10:30am	Overview of Monument Cultural and Historic Resources
10:30am - 10:40am	Break
10:40am - 12:00pm	Cultural and Historic Resources Working Group Report
12:00pm - 1:00pm	Lunch at Anasazi Heritage Center
1:00pm - 3:00pm	Discussion on Cultural and Historic Resources
3:00pm - 3:20pm	Public Comment
3:20pm - 3:30pm	Next Agenda

Note, the remainder of these minutes describes the discussion associated with each agenda topic.

Greetings and Introductions

Kelly Wilson welcomed all participants and asked them to introduce themselves. He addressed the Committee and asked if there were any requested changes to the agenda? No requested changes were noted.

Approval of Minutes from the November 14th Meeting

Kelly Wilson asked the Committee if there were any requested changes to the minutes from the November 14, 2003 meeting? No requested changes were noted. He continued by asking if the Committee had a quorum? Steve Kandell indicated that seven Committee members must be present to have a quorum and that eight Committee members were currently present.

Planning Update

Steve Kandell provided the planning update. He noted that BLM has held several workshops in September and October of 2003 as part of the planning process. They include Public Scoping Workshops in Cortez, Durango and Denver, Colorado a Community-based Stewardship Workshop and an Intertribal Tribal Workshop. He added that at this time BLM is working toward developing two planning documents including a Scoping Report and Management Situation Analysis (MSA) document. The MSA will lay out the existing condition of the resources in the Monument, and will serve as the affected environment portion of the EIS. Jones & Stokes will provide an internal review version of the MSA on December 15, 2003.

Bud Lipe asked what process was being used to summarize all the public scoping comments. Jennifer Zakrowski explained the set-up of an the access database and how the comments are entered. Comments are entered and also separated by source, geographic location and the person's affiliation if applicable. The Draft Scoping Report will be submitted to BLM from Jones & Stokes the first week of January 2004 and the final is due the first week of February 2004.

Liz Tozer heard that in Utah, property taxes went up significantly after the BLM Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument was designated. She asked if a similar situation could occur in Montezuma County. LouAnn Jacobson noted that there is a trend of agricultural property selling for less than property covered with pinyon and juniper in Montezuma County.

John Nolan from the public asked if BLM could post all of the public comments on the internet? Steve Kandell stated that the Monument's planning website will make available all the planning documents, including the Scoping Report once it is complete. LouAnn Jacobson added that not all individual comments are in an electronic format so some comments would be difficult to get on the planning website. Plus, there are over a couple thousand comments at this point.

Kelly Wilson advised members of the public that they should hold their comments to the public comment portion of the meeting.

Chris Majors asked if BLM could put the Scoping Report in some general locations for people who don't have internet access and who can't get to the Anasazi Heritage Center? Steve

Kandell responded that BLM would place copies of the scoping report in locations identified in the Monument's Public Participation Plan.

Overview of Monument Cultural and Historic Resources

Mark Varien made a presentation on cultural and historic resources in the Monument. He focused on an investigator initiated research project currently being conducted on the Monument between Crow Canyon Archaeological Center and several universities. He then displayed a map illustrating archaeological surveys conducted in the Monument. He explained that transect surveys are typically conducted because of energy exploration, whereas block surveys are research oriented. Furthermore, the Pueblo period has the greatest number of sites (600 AD to 1300 AD); however, several sites stretch from at least 6500BC to the present.

Mark Varien continued to explain how a database was developed and utilized in this research project. Modeling could lead to information such as how many households were present in each period. Momentary numbers demonstrate the best understanding of populations during these periods. There were two cycles with amazing similarities. Both populations' growth spurts are 300 years long, small populations began as dispersed settlement (single family homes), but that occurred in clusters. Highest populations were found in agricultural communities and then most people migrated from the area moving east and south. Today, they are the modern Pueblos. These are the general characteristics that typify these types of populations.

Mark Varien continued with a series of slides that demonstrated where sites were located through each time period. A member of the public asked if the map of site locations and related information is available on a website? Mark Varien offered to give her the information if she emailed him. Bill Lipe suggested to research the information through the Washington State University's Department of Anthropology web site at <http://www.wsu.edu/%7Evillage/ORTMAN%7E1.DOC.pdf>. Mark Varien continued to explain the typical site layout and how they changed over the different periods. He noted that most sites he has shown have been excavated sites. The modeling period stopped at 1140 because from AD 1140 –1180 a severe drought hit the area.

Chris Majors asked how they knew it was a drought? Mark Varien explained that it is from tree rings. No where else in the world can anyone answer as many questions about past communities and climates as we can in the Monument. Many methods currently used by archaeologist were developed on the Monument.

He continued to explain that AD 1225-1260 was when the population peaked. During this time period, sites typically consisted of 10-109 households living in close proximity to good soil. He added that these households always fall within a couple of kilometers from good water sources. Water in this area mostly came from springs. He added that the Monument actually shows records of larger villas than Mesa Verde.

He summarized by reviewing slides illustrating the density of archaeological sites during different time periods and explaining where the Pueblos currently live. Of the Pueblos here today, there are currently four language groups. Bill Lipe added that this isn't the only area where Pueblos existed. Mark Varien continued to explain how Pueblo people have their own

oral history. Both how they came into this world, and their migration stories. Tito Naranjo (member of the Committee) isn't present because of another commitment, however, he helped draft language that Mark Varien and Bill Lipe used to complete a summary of the archaeology in the area entitled "Colorado Prehistory: A Context for the Southern Colorado River Basin." Copies of the document were handed out to both the Committee and members of the public. Mark Varien noted that he hopes Tito Naranjo is present for the next Committee meeting so he can provide input on cultural resources in the Monument, noting that his position would likely be different than those presented today.

Mark Varien concluded with a slide presentation. He wanted to illustrate the difference between sites that are completely excavated versus those that are partially excavated during research (i.e., conservation archaeology).

Break

Kelly Wilson brought the meeting back to order and asked for comments from the public.

John Nolan of Dove Creek, Colorado stated that residents of his town are concerned about maintaining access to Monument. He asked if roads will be closed during the planning process.

LouAnn Jacobson responded that the planning process will make certain that private property owners, both adjacent to and within the Monument, have access to their property. Steve Kandell noted that the proclamation establishing the Monument requires that a transportation plan be developed as part of the planning process. This transportation plan will identify roads as opened or closed and what type of travel are allowed (e.g., ohv, street legal vehicles).

Amber Clark of the San Juan Citizen Alliance stated that a citizens group interested in the Monument planning process recently met in Cortez, Colorado. The citizens group wants to participate in the planning process and potentially meet with Committee members. Amber asked if Committee members would be interested in meeting with the citizens group.

Kelly wrapped up public comments and asked members of the public to introduce themselves again.

Steve Kandell then introduced some information provided to Committee members. He began with an explanation of the "Alternative Development for Core Planning Issues" handout. The worksheet provides an example of types of recommendations the Committee can make to the BLM, regarding alternatives development. The broadest level of recommendation would be goals with objectives, management actions and land use allocations being increasingly specific.

The second handout is "Core Issue Development." Steve noted that this is the first meeting to attempt this process. He reviewed the assumptions that would be addressed under each issue. The process BLM is proposing is to have a "First Cut" education component. The meeting will continue with a cut at goals and objectives, which will serve as a starting point for conversation. As a group, the Committee will have open conversations as far as what is missing, what should be changed, etc. Committee members should then gather input on these goals, objectives, etc. by meeting with their constituents and other members of the public.

Representatives of each issue should then come back to report outreach efforts and make final recommendations (with a vote). It is basically what has been discussed in the past few meetings. This will serve as the general framework.

Bill Lipe voiced concern about getting to the level of “useful” information to vote on. BLM will consider what the Committee recommends, but it will be further examined through the planning process.

Cultural and Historic Resources Working Group Report

Bill Lipe presented a list of goals, objectives, and management actions he developed. He handed out a five page document titled, “Cultural Resource Planning Issues for the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument,” dated 12/08/03 and another one dated 12/09/03. He asked the group to review these lists prior to taking their lunch break. He explained his 12/09/03 document and stressed the difference between research interests and cultural heritage interests. Research interest refers to sites valuable because they can yield data useful in addressing specific research questions, while cultural heritage interest refers to sites valuable because they represent or evoke a sense of group history and identity. The Monument offers a lot of cultural heritage. BLM must also consider effects on the local economy. Bill Lipe proceeded to explain the handout, discussing the different objectives he has identified, in addition to potential conflicts and questions to discuss this afternoon. He explained possible conflicts with grazing, oil and gas exploration, and the unknown impact increased visitor use could have on cultural resources in the Monument. The full range of archaeological research should be considered and evaluated, from remote sensing to excavating. He stressed that good arguments exist on all sides. The educational component is another issue that has several alternatives.

Bill Lipe explained that Tito Naranjo had expressed concern about Native Americans not having access to sacred sites.

Steve Kandell asked if everyone could take 20 minutes to review the goals, objectives and management actions that Bill Lipe had developed. These lists will be the focus of our afternoon discussion.

Discussion on Cultural and Historic Resources

Jennifer Zakrowski facilitated the discussion to review the proposed Cultural Resource goals objectives and management actions.

Chris Majors asked at what point have you learned enough about archaeology and therefore additional surveys are not needed. Bill Lipe noted that research builds upon itself and new technology allows you to continuously answer new questions. LouAnn Jacobson stated that the more information we have the better management decisions we can make regarding oil and gas development, recreation and grazing. Bill suggested that a phased approach for inventorying archaeological sites is needed that focuses on high use areas in the Monument.

Referring to 1-1-b (see attachment), LouAnn suggested that a schedule be proposed to prioritize inventory efforts. Referring to 1-2-a (see attached), Bill asked if this management action should be removed. Committee members suggested that it remain, but possibly revised.

Bud Poe asked if the idea of protecting the cultural landscape is addressed under Objective Two (see attached). Chris Majors then asked what is the definition of a cultural landscape. Bill stated that it is a group of related cultural properties. For example, if you look from a site in East Rock Canyon at other surrounding sites you can get a vision of how the entire canyon was inhabited. Chris asked if you can have several cultural landscapes in one area (e.g., archaeological sites mixed with corrals and line shacks). Mark Varien stated that Section 106 focuses on the protection of individual sites, but not cultural landscapes. Chris asked if managing on a landscape conflicted with multiple use activities such as oil and gas development.

Referring to 1-3-b (see attached) suggested that monitoring of archaeological sites should be specific and quantitative. Mark Varien identified two types of monitoring. One where you evaluate the impacts to sites from visitors in the frontcountry areas of the Monument, and second where you monitor in the backcountry to determine if vandalism and looting are occurring. Mark suggested that a zoning scheme could be applied in the Monument that requires different levels of monitoring from zone to zone.

Discussing Objective Two (see attached), Bill noted that the largest sites with standing walls are along canyon rims and that roads have the greatest potential for impacting archaeological sites. Where we have roads traveling to sites there needs to be a focus on education and protection of them. Chris asked if there was an inverse relationship between roads and vandalism or does more vandalism occur with more roads. Mark Varien answered that research shows that most vandalism occurs along two tracks.

Kelly Wilson highlighted that the plan needs to be specific on how law enforcement and search and rescue are to be coordinated between the BLM and local communities. Mark asked if law enforcement or education works better in protecting sites. LouAnn stated that budget constraints push us toward education since you can hire four to five recreation technicians for the cost of one law enforcement officer. Chris Majors felt that the Monument should work with the users of the land (e.g., oil and gas) in their education and enforcement efforts. Bill and Kelly agreed that education and enforcement should be approached using a community stewardship approach.

Under Objective Three (see attached), it was asked if certain sites should be limited from research. Mark noted that the existing research permitting process already addresses this question. He did add that the Monument may want to consider if research proposals should be reviewed by BLM exclusively or through a peer committee with outside input. Bill added that the plan shouldn't determine what sites are available or not available to research, but should instead develop criteria for answering this question.

Under Objective Four (see attached), it was suggested that the word facilitate be replaced with promote. Bill asked if additional sites should be developed and if the existing four developed sites in the Monument are adequate to meet future visitor demands. LouAnn noted that the existing four sites are probably enough for the next five years, though after that we may need to look at ways to direct people to new locations. LouAnn also indicated that people visiting the Monument are looking for a different experience (i.e., self directed, personal) then provided by Mesa Verde National Park.

Mark Varien suggested the Committee identify other potential sites for interpretation and development. Bill Lipe then stated that it may be better for the BLM cultural resource staff to do this, because they are more likely to be familiar with the total resources of the Monument.

Bill asked if BLM has collected oral history from the tribes. LouAnn noted that the BLM has collected oral histories, however, the tribes have been very reluctant to identify sacred sites. Bill suggested asking the tribes if there would be conflicts with sacred sites if certain areas of the Monument are opened to the public. Bill also noted that BLM needs to keep working on developing relationships with tribes.

Chris Majors highlighted the need to address the history of the Monument in the last 130 years. Furthermore, Chris stated that reducing uses on the Monument (e.g., grazing) would impact this recent history. Liz Tozer asked how BLM protect tribal sacred sites if they don't know where they are.

Mark Varien ended the open discussion by stating that information from this meeting needs to be provided to both Tito Naranjo and Selwyn Nightskunk.

Public Comment

Kelly Wilson opened up the meeting to further public comment.

Ruth Lambert provided a summary on the San Juan Mountain Association's Site Steward Program. She stated that the monitors are informed on aspects such as safety, monitoring, and law enforcement and added that the program has been working for three years. The program's mission is to create and train volunteers, provide education, and work with other groups. Currently the program has 30 participants but is looking for more monitors. The next training is at the end of February beginning of March. The program currently holds a list containing 80 sites. This list should be a starting point for BLM to identify high-use areas. Monitoring is currently done for vandalism only.

Amber Clark asked the Committee to receive public comment at meetings, prior to voting on issues. She also wanted to know how receptive the Committee would be to attending the Monument citizen group meetings. By attending these meetings, members of the citizens group wouldn't have to attend the Committee meetings. Amber Clark scheduled "topic meetings" to follow the same schedule the Committee is currently using to develop alternative recommendations to the BLM. The next public meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 16, 2003 at 6:00pm at the MagPie Coffee House in Cortez, Colorado. The scheduled discussion is cultural resources.

John Nolen reviewed the agenda, detailing how most of the conversation revolved around cultural resources rather than historical. He felt the Committee missed part of the agenda (e.g., water use, firewood collections). John noted that the cultural resource discussion identified vandalism as a major problem. Furthermore, he felt that educational outreach would be a good approach to combat vandalism. He continued to note that the views on roads and trails seemed negative; roads are very important in the Monument. Cultural resources are slowly weathering, and he doesn't feel routes and access are destructive. John indicated that nothing was discussed about the carrying capacity in the Monument and that more research should be

conducted in this area. He concluded by stating that the allotted time for public comments is way too short.

Nate Thompson asked if interpretation would be addressed? Bill Lipe responded that it got lumped under education. Nate Thompson asked if Hovenweep National Monument has been addressed? Bill Lipe added that it would be addressed in public education outreach.

Steve Kandell added that he attended a public scoping workshop for Hovenweep National Monument. At this workshop several overlapping planning issues between the two Monuments were discussed (e.g., transportation, education and interpretation). These overlapping planning issues should be discussed by the Committee as they work through their core planning issues.

A member of the public asked if any more planning newsletters had been sent out, and when the next one would be sent? Steve Kandell responded that Planning Newsletter #1 was the last one and that the next one will be sent around February 23rd.

Another member of the public inquired about archaeological inventories. She asked if the goals of future archaeological inventories were for management or research purposes. Also noted was that wood harvesting is a high impact use that is not identified for discussion by the Committee.

Gloria McMahon asked the Committee to recognize the value of the Monument. Tremendous amounts of richness located on the Monument can serve as a resource for a community that desperately needs it. The educational component of the plan should be significant and identify the local communities as partners in education.

Kelly Wilson addressed the Committee one more time for final comments. Liz Tozer noted to Amber Clark that meetings in the evening are difficult for her to attend. Mark Varien noted that “any reference to cultural resources includes both prehistoric and historic.” Bill Lipe noted that the public scoping comments are very interesting and urged other Committee members to review them. LouAnn Jacobson added that it was a good meeting and was impressed with Bill Lipe and Mark Varien.

Kelly Wilson concluded by stating that the next meeting would be held on January 6th, with cultural resources discussed in the morning and grazing in the afternoon. Kelly Wilson asked if the representative from Hovenweep National Monument had any comment. No comment was made.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30.

Cultural Resource Planning Issues for the Canyon of the Ancients National Monument

Goal: Protect and manage CANM cultural resources to ensure long-term public benefits from research, education, cultural heritage, and contributions to the local economy.

Objective 1: Obtain information needed to protect, evaluate and monitor the condition of cultural resources.

Management Action 1-1. Inventory and evaluate cultural resources

- 1-1-a. Conduct phased program to complete cultural resource inventory over a 10-year period.
- 1-1-b. Establish priorities for inventory phasing (e.g., start with high-use areas where sites are likely to be impacted by visitor use, economic development, or other effects)

Management Action 1-2. Identify high-priority sites and site complexes with special management potentials and needs

- 1-2-a. Identify sites, site complexes, or areas of the Monument having high research, educational, and cultural heritage values
- 1-2-b. Identify sites that are especially vulnerable to damage because they are highly visible, have standing walls or pictographs, or have undisturbed deposits or structures in situations where erosion is likely, etc.
- 1-2-c. Identify sites at which stabilization, fencing, or erosion control could reduce threats to site integrity, with emphasis on sites identified in 2-a and 2-b.

Management Action 1-3. Monitor condition of cultural resources, using explicit measures of resource condition.

- 1-3-a. Establish priorities for monitoring cultural resources (e.g., sites with high research or cultural heritage values that are located in high use areas should be monitored most frequently.)
- 1-3-b. Use explicit, verifiable measures of site condition in monitoring program, so that results can be compared over time.
- 1-3-c. Provide site monitoring personnel (both staff and volunteers) with training in use of monitoring measures

Objective 2. Protect cultural resources to ensure long-term use for public benefit.

Management Action 2-1. Comply with standard Section 106 procedures with respect to agency undertakings that have the potential to affect significant cultural resources.

Management Action 2-2. Increase law enforcement efforts and improve coordination with county law enforcement.

- 2-2-a. Hire additional federal law enforcement personnel experienced in enforcement of cultural resource laws
- 2-2-b. Establish liaison with county law enforcement personnel for cultural resource law enforcement
- 2-2-c. Assist county law enforcement personnel in receiving cultural resource law enforcement training.

Management Action 2-3. Enlist cooperation of interested groups and individuals.

- 2-3-a. Work with local and regional archaeological organizations and interest groups to expand site steward program (e.g., Colorado Archaeological Society chapters, Kelly Place, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortez Center, etc.).
- 2-3-b. Work with Native American and other descendant groups to identify and design measures to protect sites or areas having high cultural heritage values
- 2-3-c. Carry out appropriate stabilization, fencing, erosion control, or other protective measures, using priorities established under Management Action 2.
- 2-3-d. Establish training program about site-visit etiquette and cultural resource law for backcountry educational and recreational permittees.

Management Action 2-4. Include site protection messages in educational programs for the general public and user groups.

- 2-4-a. Ensure that BLM personnel who regularly meet the public are knowledgeable about the importance of protecting cultural resources and about cultural resource laws.
- 2-4-b. At sites that receive high public visitation, use appropriate signage, brochures, and regular ranger visits to encourage visitors to protect cultural resources.
- 2-4-c. Incorporate cultural resource protection messages in exhibits and handouts at the Anasazi Heritage Center.
- 2-4-d. Incorporate cultural resource protection messages in educational outreach programs for schools and interest groups.
- 2-4-e. Partner with local organizations and groups to develop and deliver educational programs that include messages about cultural resource protection (e.g., Colorado Archaeological Society local chapters; Cortez Center, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Kelly Place, etc.)
- 2-4-f. Work with user groups (e.g., grazing, oil and gas, ORV, recreationists, hunters) to promote understanding of cultural resource law and to enlist their support for cultural resource protection.

Objective 3. Recognize national and regional role of CANM as a laboratory for scientific/scholarly research by facilitating appropriate investigator-initiated research.

Management Action 3-1. Give potential scientific/scholarly contributions a high value in project proposal review (e.g., under ARPA or cooperative agreements), while also giving consideration to other values.

- 3-1-a. Use peer review to evaluate the scientific/scholarly potential of research proposals.
- 3-1-b. Consider archaeological research approaches (e.g., remote sensing, survey, excavation) as justified by project goals and potential results, not in terms of a priori management decisions
- 3-1-c. For research that alters the in situ archaeological record, require use of methods that minimize impact on the record consistent with obtaining needed information.

Management Action 3-2. Encourage archaeological research that achieves multiple management objectives, consistent with contributing new knowledge (e.g., encourage projects that in addition to contributing important new knowledge about the past, have interdisciplinary goals, or have public education components, or contribute information needed for management purposes, or that represent productive cooperation between researchers and cultural descendant communities)

- 3-2-a Encourage interdisciplinary projects that have the potential to produce significant new ecological or other scientific information, in addition to archaeological results.
- 3-2-a Encourage research at sites, site complexes, or areas of the Monument where public access and public education will be focused, while remaining open to proposals for appropriate, well-justified research elsewhere.
- 3-2-b. For field research in “back-country” areas, establish requirements for vehicular access, etc. that are consistent with maintaining environmental quality.

Management Action 3-3. Ensure that concerns of descendant communities are considered in research project design, review, and permitting.

- 3-3-a Identify sites, site complexes, or areas of the Monument that are considered to be sacred or about which descendant communities have particular concern.
- 3-3-b Facilitate direct communication between archaeological researchers and representatives of descendant communities so their concerns can be taken into account in project design and so researchers can communicate their goals and proposed methods.

Objective 4. Facilitate educational use of monument resources to enhance public understanding and enjoyment of the past and of cultural diversity without compromising qualities such as remoteness and lack of commercialization that characterize the Monument.

Management Action 4-1. Focus on-site public education in selected sites or areas

- 4-1-a. Use moderate amounts of stabilization, construction of trails, signage, etc. to channel visitor use of sites and areas to protect cultural properties while permitting positive visitor experience.
- 4-1-b. Provide adequate but still semi-primitive visitor accommodations (i.e., parking, restroom facilities, information kiosks)
- 4-1-c. Provide adequate but not intrusive on-site interpretation in the form of signs and brochures. In addition to archaeologists' interpretation, materials should provide Native American perspectives, and information about site etiquette and respect for the sacred character of cultural heritage values in the Monument area.
- 4-1-d. Require large groups (e.g., bus tours) to be accompanied by a BLM interpreter or trained guide/outfitter.
- 4-1-e. Conduct regular ranger or staff visits to selected sites in order to contact visitors and also to check for problems.

Management Action 4-2. Provide for public access to backcountry sites and areas for educational purposes.

- 4-2-a. Require groups planning archaeologically-oriented visits to obtain a backcountry permit and to show that the trip leader has adequate training in archaeological interpretation, cultural resource law, site etiquette, and cultural heritage sensitivity.
- 4-2-b. Develop training program in archaeological interpretation, cultural resource law, site etiquette, and cultural heritage sensitivity for backcountry guides, outfitters and educational trip leaders.
- 4-2-c. Limit size of archaeologically-oriented backcountry groups to 15, including staff.
- 4-2-d. Provide informational/educational materials for individual backcountry visitors at main entry points to backcountry areas (both roads and trails).
- 4-2-e. Include information for potential back-country visitors in public educational programs delivered outside the Monument (e.g., at the Anasazi Heritage Center, in schools, in presentations to groups, etc.)

Management Action 4-3. Develop educational programs for delivery outside the Monument.

- 4-3-a. Monument staff, working with other education specialists in BLM, should develop exhibits, videos, print materials, etc. that interpret Monument resources and that can be delivered in a variety of venues (e.g., Anasazi Heritage Center, schools, talks to interest groups, etc.)
- 4-3-b. Monument staff should collaborate with other entities (e.g., local chapters of Colorado Archaeological Society, Colorado Historical Society, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Kelly Place, etc.) to design and deliver educational materials and programs about the Monument to the general public.

Objective 5. Preserve cultural heritage values of cultural resources and landscapes

Management Action 5-1. Seek information and advice about heritage values from individuals and groups having cultural connections to the Monument area.

Management Action 5-2. Ensure access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties by individuals and groups having cultural connections to the Monument area.

Management Action 5-3. Consider the importance of setting and context in designing management approaches to preserving the heritage values of particular sites and areas.

Management Action 5-4. Develop and carry out educational programs to ensure that Monument visitors understand and respect its cultural heritage values

Objective 6. Consider local and regional economic benefits of management decisions and actions, while giving priority to maintaining and providing access to the Monument's research, educational, and cultural heritage values.